DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 625 RC 013 678

AUTHOR Cortese, Anthony J.; Duncan, Margaret I.
TITLE The Denial of Access: Chicanos in Higher Education.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, CA, September, 1982).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Aspiration; *Access to Education; Acculturation; *Affirmative Action; College Attendance; Dropout Rate; *Educational Discrimination; Enrollment; *Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; *Mexican Americans; Social Psychology; Student Alienation; *Student Attrition
IDENTIFIERS *Chicanos

ABSTRACT

Chicanos are underrepresented in U.S. institutions of higher education. Attrition and completion rates indicate that a significant number of Chicanos who do choose to enroll in institutions fail to complete their degrees at each successively higher level, and are subject to high dropout rates. The percentage of Chicano students completing the associate, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees for the year 1975-76 is 4.6%, 2.86%, 1.96%, and 1.22%, respectively. While Hispanic students are increasingly enrolling in two-year institutions, their completion rate is only 7.6%. Affirmative action programs, by the federal government and by institutions, have helped to increase the Chicanos' access to institutions of higher education. However, given the current social climate, these programs cannot be relied upon as the sole instrument which Chicanos might use to increase their access to higher education. The sociocultural elements within the traditional community which may act as barriers to participation in higher education (e.g., alienation, acculturation and the Chicano family, sociocultural psychology, cultural tradition, and the social message) must also be examined. Because Hispanics are the fastest growing minority within the U.S., access to higher education is critical if Hispanics are to participate in decision-making forums and enjoy higher employment status and higher paying positions. (NQA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224625

THE DENIAL OF ACCESS:

CHICANOS IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Anthony Cortese

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Anthony J. Cortese
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Director of Chicano Studies

and

Margaret I. Duncan
Director of Office of Equal Opportunity

Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

September 1982

Not for quotation without permission of authors

Paper presented at the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, CA, September, 1982).

RC01 3678

THE DENIAL OF ACCESS: CHICANOS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A B S T R A C T

The purpose of this paper is to explore possible explanations for the extremely low rate of participation for Chicanos in higher education. Data on enrollment, attrition and achievement are presented as an indication of the extent to which Chicanos are underrepresented in such institutions. The socio-legal background of minority education is briefly sketched. Next, the social environment is discussed, highlighting alienation, acculturation and the Chicano family, sociocultural psychology, cultural tradition and the social message. Finally, suggestions for future research are offered.

The last shall be first.

--The King James Bible--

If not now, when?

--Hillel--

THE DENIAL OF ACCESS: CHICANOS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The access, admission, and retention of racial and ethnic minority students to institutions of higher education involve complex and controversial issues and problems which bear substantially on social policy. Given the fact that Hispanics are the fastest growing minority group within the United States (U. S. News and World Report, 1981:64), issues of access, retention and achievement will become critical if members of this group are to begin to approach parity in decision-making processes. While structural discrimination in all facets of society must yet be dismantled, this paper will focus on the issue of participation of Chicanos in higher education. Accordingly, data are presented on the extent to which Chicanos are underrepresented in institutions of higher education. The social environment and elements of the Chicano cultural traditions will then be reviewed in an attempt to explain this underrepresentation.

Any discussion of this nature must certainly include the U. S. Supreme Court decision in the case of the Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978), which has affected undergraduate, graduate and professional schools' admissions programs. Although the court struck specific quota systems as unconstitutional, it did not prohibit affirmative action and the consideration of race or ethnicity as a criterion for admission. Nonetheless, the winds of unwelcomed admissions retrenchment for minorities filled the air. In response, the Office for Civil Rights (1978), of the then Department of Health, Education and Welfare (OCR-DHEW) released a policy interpretation which indicated that race and ethnicity could be considered as a positive factor in the admissions process.

Presently, affirmative action procedures, or the lack thereof, vary from campus to campus. An ad-hoc group of forty Deans recently prepared a

proposal to be submitted to the Association of American Colleges reemphasizing "more rigorous standards of admissions." (Chronicle of Higher Education, January 19, 1981.) Given the current trend away from vigorous enforcement of civil rights, the use of traditional tests, predictive criteria and standards will be raised by more than one professional organization. What concerns the authors is not that the dialogue will continue, but that Chicanos are once again on the receiving end of the debate. As noted by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1981: p. 10):

> If many educational systems from kindergarten through college had not historically favored white males, more minorities and women would hold advanced degrees and thereby be included among those involved in deciding what academic tests should test.

Institutional racism and discriminatory practices are still deeply imbedded in the characteristics of this society. This invidiousness will end only when the experiences of those previously excluded are represented by "the last" themselves, i.e., when the names, faces, and genders of the decision-makers change.

Denial of Access

The measurement of access of any group or groups to the benefits of educational opportunities requires a review of enrollment, attrition, and completion statistics as well as consideration of the socio-legal context. Data displayed in this section are utilized to illustrate the acute underrepresentation of Chicanos in terms of enrollment in institutions of higher education within the United States, excluding Puerto Rico and Hawaii. Attrition and completion rates also indicate that a significant number of Chicanos who do choose to enroll in institutions fail to complete their degrees at each successively higher level, and are subject to high dropout rates. The

current socio-legal context is becoming increasingly discouraging in terms of sensitivity to the continuing need to redress imbalances of the past.

Enrollment

Table 1, below, provides data on the enrollment of Chicanos as a percent of full time students in institutions of higher education between 1972 and 1978.

[Table 1 about here]

Enrollment data in columns one and two of Table 1 display the extent to which Hispanics have enjoyed an increase in enrollment in institutions of higher education, at the undergraduate, graduate, and first-professional levels. The enrollment at the undergraduate level has increased from 2.1% in 1970 to 3.5% in 1978. This is in contrast to a lower percentage increase at the graduate and first-professional levels, from 1.2% in 1970 to 2.2% in 1978.

The enrollment of Hispanics as a percentage of the 18-34 population has also increased, from 8.3% in 1972 to 14.2% in 1976. While encouraging, the data displayed in columns three and four also illustrate that Hispanic college enrollment is still, in the given years, below that of their white non-hispanic counterparts. The data, however, must be viewed with caution, since the population count given for whites includes White Hispanics.

Ultimately, if one is interested in determining the applicant pool from which two year and four year colleges and universities might draw, it is necessary to contrast actual enrollment with potential enrollment. Accordingly, columns five and six display Hispanic and white high school graduates as a percentage of the 18-34 population. Focusing on Hispanics, it is clear that although the percentage of Hispanics enrolled in college as a percentage of the 18-34 population is increasing (see column three),

the applicant pool of high school graduates has also grown. Moreover, by subtracting the figures given in column five from those provided in column three, one can determine that in the years 1972, 1974 and 1976, potential applicants with high school diplomas and certificates choosing not to pursue college enrollment between the ages of 18-34 decreased from 41.2% to 41.1% to 39.1% respectively. Viewed from this perspective, one can conclude, albeit dismally, that rather than becoming too cheerful about the increased enrollment of Hispanics in institutions of higher education, as displayed in column one, it might be well to consider the extent to which Hispanics in the applicant pool choose not to pursue higher education. Indeed, as the population of Hispanics continues to grow in the future, attention must be focused on this "applicant gap" if the underrepresentation of Chicanos in higher status employment and decision-making opportunities in the post-industrial society is to be corrected.

Data on enrollment in medical and law schools also illustrate a severe underrepresentation of Chicanos. In 1970, Chicanos comprised .5% of the medical school enrollment and .9% of law school enrollment. (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1978a.) By 1977, Chicano medical and law school enrollment had increased to 1.4% and 1.2%, respectively. Even the minimal gains experienced by minorities are in jeopardy, according to Dr. Frank Roybal, president of the National Medical Association. In the Fall of 1981, the Graduate Medical Education National Advisory Committee predicted a surplus of physicians in the United States by 1990. As well, recommendations of a "cutoff of all per-student capitation grants, and a drastic cutback on low-interest loans and scholarships were incorporated into the fiscal 1982 budget

reconciliation measure signed into law last summer" (Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, 1981:10). As Dr. Roybal noted, projected "surplus" of doctors failed to consider the sensitivities of minority health consumers, as well as the lack of medical services received by minorities in the urban and rural areas of concentration. The cutback on loans and scholarships is also expected to impact negatively on minority student enrollment in medical schools.

Attrition

Attrition, as represented by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is defined as the loss of enrollment of students from one year to the next. This does not include students who transfer to other institutions. NCES data are student-specific, based on sample surveys, subject to error.

Percentage figures for the drop-out rate of Chicano students of the high school class of 1972 are higher for those students pursuing programs at two-year institutions, i.e., 49.7% than for those Hispanics pursuing Bachelor's degrees, at 44.4%. Of those students enrolled in two year programs, at the end of two years, 7.6% had completed their programs, whereas 44.6% were still enrolled. This is in contrast to the status of students opting for the Bachelor's program in 1972, where 12.8% completed the Bachelor's degree, and 22.8% were still enrolled (de los Santos et al, 1980). The drop out rate for students in two year institutions and four year institutions is alarmingly high. Drawing upon other literature which indicates that Hispanic students are increasingly enrolling in two year institutions, the completion rate of only 7.6% also assumes importance.

Achievement

The percentage of Chicano students completing the Associate, Bachelor, Master and doctoral degrees for the year 1975-76 is 4.6%, 2.86%, 1.96% and

1.22% respectively (de los Santos et al., 1980). Historically, it has been the case that the higher the type of degree, the fewer are the number of Hispanics receiving the degree. Despite the increase in numbers of Hispanics receiving the four types of degrees, there is again cause for concern when one considers the extent to which Hispanics will participate in higher-paying and higher status employment opportunities, when, if population trends continue, they become the predominant minority group within the United States. Within higher education, less than 4 percent of Chicanos (25 years and over) had completed 4 years of college, compared to nearly 16 percent of the non-Spanish population. Table 2 illustrates 4-year college experience differentiation by ethnicity and sex across time for persons between the ages of 25-29.

[Table 2 about here]

To measure achievement solely on the basis of completion of degrees has definite merit. Yet, institutional practices also affect students' achievement and motivation. Certainly, the employment profiles of schools across the nation reflect the severe lack of role models. An example of this is provided by New York City, where, in 1977, about half of the 3,000 bilingual teachers were Hispanic, although 85% of the students in the bilingual program were Hispanic (Council on Interracial Books for Children, 1978). Table 3 provides teacher-student ratios in selected cities. Substantial underrepresentation of both Hispanic and Black teachers is evident.

[Table 3 about here]

Educational segregation is also an issue. The Council on Interracial Books for Children (1978) supplies further statistics. In 1974-75, 67% of

Hispanic children were in predominately minority schools. Moreover, nearly two-thirds of all Spanish-surnamed students in New York City schools were in schools with 99% to 100% minority enrollment. Students in schools with predominately minority enrollments tend to display lower scores on scholastic achievement tests. While 13-year-old Anglo students achieve 2.73% above the national average in reading levels, their Hispanic and Black counterparts score 11.25% and 13.95% respectively below the national average. Hispanic students in the Northeast were almost 18% below the national average in social studies and 17% below in mathematics.

Despite the disparities in achievement levels, debate still exists as to whether socio-economic status and environment is more important than racial isolation in terms of achievement. As well, the issue of culturally fair tests must be considered. A concomitant element of discussion is that of the allocation of resources, in terms of per-pupil expenditures, facilities, quality of teachers and other factors capable of quantification. While these issues will not be discussed in this paper, they are raised to suggest that the relationships must be fully explored and defined if the achievement levels of Chicanos in higher education are to increase, both in terms of degrees awarded and access to quality educational opportunities.

Socio-Legal Context

It is impossible to appreciate the question of access without considering the social context through which institutional practices and processes have evolved. This social context has been inimical to the rights of minorities, as illustrated by the legal sanction of "separate but equal" facilities granted by the U.S. Supreme Court (Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896 and Cumming v. Richmond County Board of Education, 1899), until the historical Brown v. Board

of Education, 1954). In spite of recognition of their rights under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, Mexican Americans living in the annexed Southwest and West suffered the same conditions as did Black Americans, i.e., separate educational facilities which were underfunded, understaffed, and subject to shorter school terms. Administrative rulings such as that made by the state of New Mexico, declaring that English would be the sole language of public instruction, were not atypical. As concluded by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1978a: p. 3), "Mexican Americans received a second-rate education which left large numbers of students no alternative to the manual labor that had been the lot of their parents."

With the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, minority enrollment in institutions of higher education became an important issue; and, as enrollment figures presented above illustrate, participation, if not parity, has grown. Nor is there evidence that the Bakke decision dissuaded professional organizations from persisting in their belief that race should be considered a relevant factor in the admissions process (Association of American Medical Colleges, Law School Admission Council, Carnegie Commission on Policy Studies, and American Association of University Professors). As well, the then OCR-DHEW issued a policy interpretation of Title VI assuring that race could be taken into consideration as a positive factor in determining applicants' qualifications for admission.

If the social context in the late sixties and early to mid-seventies inspired confidence that the nation was alert to the need to eliminate racist and discriminatory practices, the climate of the late seventies and early eighties dictates caution and deliberative persistence. In a study of the effects of desegregation released in September of 1981, Dr. Willis D. Hawley,

of Vanderbilt University, asserted that desegregation of schools "has had positive effects for all children, especially for minority students, and has improved educational opportunity" (Denver Post, 1981: p. 8a). The court system as well has tended to articulate the view that segregation results in unequal educational opportunity, although confusion still exists regarding standards of equality in terms of input and output, and what remedies may be applied under the law (Kutner, 1979). Such positive research findings and legal testimony come at a time, however, when the president of the United States is conveying the attitude that "the American people want to withdraw from desegregation" (Denver Post, 1981: p. 8a). It is now, in the midst of these messages, coupled with cuts in federal funding, and challenges of reverse discrimination and preferential treatment that Chicanos, who have been slower than have Blacks to realize their potential, must prepare as a group to claim their rights to equal educational opportunity.

It is our contention that rather than relying on a social context which is friendly and affirmative, there is much work yet to be done within the Hispanic community to determine what factors in addition to discrimination, or engendered by it, have hindered their participation in education at the higher levels. This is a formidable challenge, when one considers the comparative dearth of research on the Hispanic experience within the United States. Nonetheless, this work must be undertaken if the past is not to be a presage of the future. What factors, for example, set the potential or present Chicano student apart from his/her Black, Native American Indian or Asian American counterpart as s/he faces decisions concerning what schools to apply to and what professions and careers s/he will pursue? The purpose of the following section is to analyze the problems peculiar to the Chicano within the larger realm of higher education.

The Social Environment: Combatting Institutional Racism

It has been argued repeatedly that America's schools are failing to provide equal educationalopportunities for Chicanos. A report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1974) documented this assertion: (1) Chicanos attend schools separated from their Anglo counterparts; (2) they are under-represented as teachers and counselors and in decision making positions, e.g., principal, school board; (3) the language and culture of Chicano children are ignored or even surpressed by schools; (4) Chicano parents are largely excluded from participation in school affairs; (5) schools with predominantly Chicano enrollments are under-financed in comparison to "Anglo" schools; (6) many teachers fail to involve Chicano children as active participants in the educational process. Possibly the most salient demonstration of the failure of our schools is mirrored in the educational attainment of Chicano students as discussed above.

Current noted paradigms of the lower performance of Chicanos emphasize that they are a non-English-speaking minority and that their culture differs substantially from the dominant Anglo culture. Other variables commonly linked to lower achievement are lack of family and community support for education, the "culture of poverty" and "cultural deprivation", and the educational platforms and tactics of the schools attended by Chicanos. In the 1960s, cultural deprivation explanations were dominant. Such views affected compensatory educational policies which did little to improve school performance. Today's linguistic and cultural explanations imply the development and implementation of bilingual and bicultural education. Yet education programs are heading in the opposite direction.

Language and cultural differences are important in school performance, but perhaps more important is the caste-like status of the Chicano. Mexican-Americans were conquered and stripped of power in the southwestern states. "This process of conquest and colonization involved violence and brutality on the part of the conquerors, a system of privilege based on racism, and the exploitation of the labor of Mexicans and other poor people." (Acuña, 1981:1). Since the nineteenth century Mexicans have been socialized to accept their low status and "the American way." Education has been and continues to be a tool to legitimize those in power. Anglo attitudes toward Chicanos are affected by the folk ideologies or stereotypes supporting the latter's historically subordinate status and by phenotypical differences. Hence, discriminatory practices have become institutionalized. And, as discriminatory practices continue, so does the cycle of structural discrimination:

> Discrimination in education denies the credentials to get good jobs. Discrimination in employment denies the economic resources to buy good housing. Discrimination in housing confines its victims to school districts providing inferior education, closing the cycle in a classic form. (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981:11).

This cycle reinforces and compounds the sense of alienation experienced by Chicanos in the Anglo dominated society.

Alienation

Anglo dominated environments alone generally are insignificant in encouraging alienation and negative ethnic self attitudes. In fact, they appear to enhance ethnic salience in self identification (Iadicola, 1981). Nevertheless, high socioeconomic status dominated environments foster negative ethnic self attitudes and promote alienation by diminishing the level of ethnic salience in self identification. Iadicola also notes that Hispanic

students' own socioeconomic status level either insulates the individual from the negative effects of a high socioeconomic status school environment or enhances the negative effect of school socioeconomic status upon ethnic attitudes. In sum, it is not the presence of Anglo students alone as much as it is the presence of upper-middle class students which animates alienation in Chicano students.

Iadicola's (1981) findings suggest more emphasis on socio-economic status desegregation and less on ethnic desegregation. In the past, equal educational opportunity for Chicanos meant repudiation of their cultural background, perhaps too large an expense to pay for access. Pragmatically, affirmative action in higher education involves two incongruent goals: assimilation and the improvement of intergroup relations through equal status relations. A college or university which is conducive to assimilation, one with a high level of Anglo students and socioeconomic status, creates status inequalities between Anglo and Chicano students. Through such assimilation, improvement in intergroup relations results from the absorption of the subordinate group into the dominant culture. But why must Chicanos assimilate in order to achieve meritocracy?

A power analysis would focus on the process of regulating dominated social classes and cultural categories through the basic institutions and organizations of our society. In addition to types of control, one must determine what it is about the social system which make these particular systems of control necessary. Indeed, the denial of access to Chicanos in higher education is part of this larger issue.

Acculturation and the Chicano Family

A great deal has been written about the Chicano family (Murillo, 1971). Peñalosa (1968) stated some years ago that neither empirical data nor an adequate theoretical framework exists for the analysis of the Chicano family structure. This remains true today. Acculturation pressures have forced the Chicano family away from the Mexican prototype (Martinez, 1977:30). "Instead there are literally thousands of Mexican-American families, all differing significantly from one another along a variety of dimensions." (Murillo, 1971:97). It is well known that the Chicano population is not homogeneous. Some Chicanos identify more with the Mexican culture and some with the Anglo culture.

Olmedo, Martinez and Martinez (1976) developed an acculturation scale for Chicanos and found that the Anglo population is more homogeneous than the Chicano population; the overlap of the Chicano population into the Anglo distribution is much greater than the converse. At the extreme end of the Chicano distribution, where it might be said that Chicanismo is defined, there were no Anglos. Conversely, on the extreme side of the Anglo distribution there are few Chicanos. Perhaps a more important finding was that the mean score of Chicanos in a high school with only 10 percent Chicanos is closer to the Anglo mean than the means of students from other high schools where there were greater proportions of Chicanos.

Sociocultural Psychology

Chicano psychologists (e.g., Martinez, 1977) have been gathering information on the behavior of Chicanos under the assumption that such behavior can be understood only if viewed within the cultural context in which it occurs.

Currently a situation exists where improperly applied explanations of the behavior of Chicanos may harm them by creating or reinforcing already existing stereotypical images. For example, Mercer (1977) demonstrates that the "IQ gap" between Chicanos and Anglos can be accounted for by the acculturation level of the Chicano. Therefore, a large number of Chicanos who are classified as "unintelligent" and so labeled for the rest of their lives may not be unintelligent at all. Yet, standardized IQ tests are used daily in schools to assess the intellecual functioning of Chicano children. Olmedo (1977) indicates that the American Psychological Association is insensitive to this issue. Accordingly, the need and justification of a Chicano psychology was born out of the moral vacuum of the science and profession of psychology. Moreover, a sociocultural psychology is more scientific, parsimonious, and universal than traditional American and European systems of psychology which have labored under the assumption that behavior is best explained by variables within individuals (Diaz-Guerrero, 1977:17).

Cultural Tradition

Cultural traditions socialize individuals through family activity, peer group, common literature, formal associations, ingroup marriage and segregation. The empirical literature supports a broad conclusion about the development of social motives and behaviors among Chicano children (Kagan, 1977:73). Chicano children develop stronger group enhancement and altruism motives than Anglo children, who develop stronger competitive motives (Madsen, 1971). The greater cooperativeness of Chicano children manifests itself as they: 1) more often choose the cooperative alternative in experimental tasks (Madsen and Shapiro, 1970), 2) tend more often to behave spontaneously as members of

a group, in contrast to Anglo children who, faced with the same situation, behave individualistically (Kagan and Madsen, 1972), 3) less frequently contradict their mothers in potential conflict situations (Hoppe et al, 1977) and 4) tend to be higher on need for achievement for the family (Ramirez and Price-Williams, 1976).

Madsen's (1971) cross-cultural study of cooperative and competitive behavior of young children suggests a higher level of cooperation among Chicano children than among Anglos. "Not only was there far more cooperative interaction, but the competitive responses, when they did occur, were far less vigorous" (1971:369-370). One hypothesis to account for the apparent differences in the psychological functioning of the two cultural groups is that Chicano children develop as rational problem-solvers in social situations while Anglo children develop such a high level of competitive motivation that behavior is irrational in conflict-of-interest situations. Chicano children also manifest an "other orientation," concern for and sensitivity to the feelings and wishes of people who are important to self.

The Social Message

The cooperative orientation of Chicano children may not be conducive to success in school. A competitive atmosphere in the classroom pervades our educational institutions. Success in taking standardized and rigidly administered examinations is a requisite for academic advancement. Individual achievement is strongly encouraged and is paramount for capturing the attention of one's mentor. We have offered evidence suggesting that the Chicano culture socializes individuals in much the opposite manner. Consequently, the Chicano often faces the choice of remaining true to oneself

and one's background or attempting to succeed in the Anglo-dominated educational environment. Also affecting achievement is the fact that schools convey different messages to Chicano and Anglo students. The communication to the Anglo student is similar to the American belief that perseverance in school results in economic success, self-improvement and prestige. To the Chicano, the message is contrary, the more education, the less s/he earns in relation to his/her Anglo peers. To be sure, these contradictory dispatches negatively affect the Chicano's educational aspirations. The job and income ceiling also inhibit the educational motivation of the Chicano.

That the Chicano observes and responds to the obstacles in future employment and social status perhaps induces "mental withdrawal" (Carter, 1970). Though the Chicano may not linger behind his/her Anglo counterpart in school performance in the first several grades, his/her achievement during the intermediate grades plunges acutely (Carter, 1970:178). While a middle class background supplies the type of support and rewards that proliferates high academic performance, a Chicano or lower-class heritage does not breed such returns. Thus, middle-class Anglo children do well in school because of anticipatory socialization. Chicano parents, in contrast, may not mislead their children by promising them substantial future social payoffs for high academic achievement.

In conclusion, for Chicanos, educational attainment has not resulted in the same economic and social premiums that Anglos reap. Thus, Chicanos' lower school performance might be an adjustment of their social and occupational statuses in society. Such institutional discrimination enhances problems instigated by cultural and languages differences.

Conclusion

Chicanos are underrepresented in institutions of higher education in terms of enrollment and completion of degrees. Affirmative Action programs, as sponsored and enforced by the federal government, as well as voluntary and court-ordered affirmative action efforts by institutions cannot, given the current social climate, be relied upon as the sole instrument which Chicanos might use to increase their access to institutions of higher education. Because Hispanics as a group are the fastest growing minority within the United States, access to higher education is critical if Hispanics, including Chicanos, are to participate in decision-making forums and enjoy higher status and higher paying positions in the employment arena. Structural discrimination, as well as institutional racism, persist within the United States. Accordingly, group entitlement cannot be expected to be bestowed upon Chicanos by benevolent forces. Rather, it must be gained by continual pressure from within the Hispanic community as a whole. Higher education has been, and will continue to be, the major route to greater participation in the benefits of living in a post industrial society.

Given these conclusions, it is critical to focus more attention on possible explanations for the non-participation of Chicanos in higher education. It is our contention that objective data on enrollment, attrition, and completion are sufficient to indicate a problem. As well, Chicanos within the United States have experienced discrimination, and will no doubt continue to experience discrimination. The task, then, is to examine the socio-cultural elements within the traditional community which may act as barriers to participation in higher education. It is not within the authors' purview

to suggest that barriers which may be discovered should be eliminated. In fact, there may be attributes, such as the cooperative orientation, which are more suitable to decision-making in an inter-dependent world of nations than are the individualistic, competitive modes that characterize the Anglo model.

Implications of research on Chicanos point to the importance of social experience as indicated by the norms, values and related moral stances of the Chicano culture. In light of the heterogeneity of the Chicano population, more attention for future research should be given to variation among Chicano children's background. The literature indicates that generation removed from Mexico, geographical location, area of residence (i.e., within a Hispanic community vis-à-vis an Anglo suburb), socioeconomic status, variation in family structure and sibling order are related to acculturation and socialization which in turn might affect educational access and aspirations differentially.

*In this article the term "Chicano" is used to refer to all people descended in part from Mexico and living in the United States. In this sense the term is synonomous to "Mexican American," as in forms requesting specification of racial/ethnic background where the terms appear as interchangeable. However, some persons make a distinction between the terms and refer to Chicanos as those who support a particular political ideology or movement in relation to

their ethnic heritage. Hence, an individual may refer to him/herself as "Chicano" but not "Mexican American" and vice versa. These terms can be distinguished from the more general term "Hispanic" which refers to a broad group of Spanish-speaking people including, for example, Latin Americans and South Americans.

REFERENCES

Acuña, R. Occupied America (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483, 1954.

Carter, T. Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Chronicle of Higher Education, January 19, 1981.

Council on Interracial Books for Children. Fact Sheets on Institutional Racism. New York, 1978.

De los Santos, A. Jr., J. Montemayor, and E. Solis. Chicano Students in Institutions of Higher Education: Access, Attrition, and Achievement. Office for Advanced Research in Hispanic Education, University of Texas at Austin, December 1980.

Denver Post, September 16, 1981, p. 8a.

Diaz-Guerrero, R. "A Sociocultural Psychology," pp. 17-27 in J. L. Martinez, Jr., Chicano Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. November 30, 1981, Vol. 7 No. 24, p. 10.

Hoppe, C. M., S. M. Kagan, and G. L. Zahn. "Conflict Resolution among Field-Independent and Field-Dependent Anglo-American and Mexican-American Children and Their Mothers," Developmental Psychology, 1977, 13 (November): 591-598.

Iadicola, P. "Peer Group Centextual Factors and Hispanic Students' Attitudes Toward Their Own Ethnic Group." Paper presented at the Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, April 1981, Louisville, Kentucky.

Kagan, S. "Social Motives and Behaviors of Mexican-American and Anglo-American Children," pp. 45-86 in J. L. Martinez, Jr. (ed.), Chicano Psychology New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Kagan, S. and M. Madsen. "Experimental Analysis of Cooperation and Competition of Anglo-American and Mexican Children," Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6:49-59.

Kutner, P. B. "Keyes v. School District Number one: A Constitutional Right to Equal Educational Opportunity?", 1979, 8 (January):1-43.

Madsen, M. C. "Developmental and Cross-Cultural Differences in the Cooperative and Competitive Behavior of Young Children," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1971, 4:365-371.

Madsen, M. and A. Shapiro. "Cooperative and Competitive Behavior of Urban Afro-American, Anglo-American, Mexican-American, Mexican Village Children," Developmental Psychology, 1970, 10:269-274.

Martinez, J., Jr. (ed.). Chicano Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Mercer, J. R. "Identifying the Gifted Chicano Child," pp. 155-173 in J. Martinez (ed.), Chicano Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Murillo, N. "The Mexican-American Family," pp. 97-108 in C. A. Hernandez, M. J. Haug and N. N. Wagner (eds.), Chicanos: Social and Psychological Perspectives (2nd ed.). St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1971.

National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans. Wasington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs; Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Policy Interpretation, 45 CFR Part 80, 1978.

Olmedo, E. L. "Psychological Testing and the Chicano: A Reassessment," pp. 175-195 in J. Martinez (ed.), Chicano Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Olmedo, E., J. L. Martinez, Jr. and S. Martinez. Development of an Acculturation Scale for Chicanos. Univeristy of California, Los Angeles: Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research Center, 1976.

Peñalosa, F. "Mexican Family Roles," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30:680-689.

Ramirez, M. and Price-Williams, D. R. "Achievement Motivation in Children of Three Ethnic Groups in the United States," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1976, 7:49-60.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans. Report VI: Mexican American Education Study, February 1974.

_____. Toward Equal Educational Opportunity: Affirmative Admissions Programs at Law and Medical Schools. Clearinghouse Publication 55, June 1978a, pp. 7, 21.

_____. Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women, August 1978b.

_____. Affirmative Action in the 1980s: Dismanteling the Process of Discrimination. Clearinghouse Publication 70, November 1981, p. 11.

U. S. News and World Report, August 24, 1981, p. 64.

Table 1*

HISPANIC ENROLLMENT

	Hisp. % of Total Enrollment		Enrollment in College as % of 18-34 Population**		High School Grad as % of 18-34 Population**	
	Undergrad.	Grad. & 1st Prof.	Hispanic	White	Hispanic	White
1972	2.4	1.2	8.3	16.0	49.5	80.4
1974	2.8	1.5	11.5	15.7	52.6	82.7
1976	3.3	2.0	14.2	16.6	53.3	83.0
1978	3.5	2.2	---	---	---	---

*SOURCE: National Center for Educational Statistics. The Condition of Education for Hispanics. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

**1978 data unavailable.

Table 2*

PERCENT OF POPULATION 25-29 YEARS OF AGE WHO HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 4 YEARS OF COLLEGE, BY ETHNICITY AND SEX, 1960, 1970 and 1976

Ethnicity	1960		1970		1976	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Blacks	4	6	6	8	11	11
Chicanos	4	2	5	3	11	5
Anglos	20	9	22	14	34	22

*SOURCE: Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, August 1978.

Table 3*

STUDENT/TEACHER RATIOS FOR SELECTED CITIES BY ETHNICITY

School District	% White	% Black	% Spanish Surnamed	% Asian American	% American Indian
New York City					
Students	33.2%	36.6%	28.0%	2.1%	0.1%
Teachers	86.8	9.6	3.1	0.5	0.0
Los Angeles					
Students	41.9	24.7	27.8	5.1	4.0
Teachers	68.9	16.1	4.8	6.6	0.8
Chicago					
Students	28.2	47.9	12.7	1.0	0.2
Teachers	56.8	39.9	2.4	0.8	0.0
Philadelphia					
Students	33.2	61.7	4.7	0.3	0.1
Teachers	59.8	39.5	0.5	0.1	0.0
Detroit					
Students	26.4	71.6	1.7	0.2	0.1
Teachers	49.4	49.5	0.5	0.5	0.1

*SOURCE: Council on Interracial Books for Children, Fact Sheets on Institutional Racism, (October 1978), p. 15.